REMARKS

Claims 1 -20 are pending.

In the office action that was mailed May 14, 2008, claims 1-20 were *objected to* because claim 1 and some of the dependent claims contained limitations that were recited passively or which were capable of being construed as being optional. Claims 1-19 were *rejected* under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. pre-grant publication 2002/0029214 by Yianilos et al. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yianilos alone.

The claim rejections were made final. This response is therefore submitted with a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.114.

The claims have been amended to overcome the objections by replacing passive claim language with active voice. The claim objections are therefore believed to be overcome.

Regarding the prior art claim *rejections*, various self-explanatory limitations have been added to the independent claims to differentiate the claimed subject matter from Yianilos. Paraphrased, the independent claim preambles have been amended to recite that a database is comprised of a plurality of records, records are comprised of fields and fields are populated with data. The preambles thus provide antecedent bases for limitations that have been added to the bodies of the claims.

Support for the preamble revisions can be found in the specification paragraph 0037 but also in dependent claim 5. No new matter has been added by amending the claim preambles to recite common database components.

Importantly, claims 1 and 15 have also been amended to recite that "hash values" are "more computationally complex" than a checksum and therefore "different from" a check sum, which is stated in paragraph [0042]. In other words, hash values are not checksums.

8

The independent claims now require that a single hash value be computed over an entire database in each of the network and the mobile node. A first type of hash function is used to calculate a "first hash value" from an entire database in the mobile node. The same type of hash function is used to compute the "first hash value" over the network copy of the same database, located in the network. If the two "first hash values" don't match each other, the amended claims require that a conclusion be made that the two databases are out of match, in which case, a second hash value is calculated over individual records in the mobile and at the network but the second hash value is determined using a second technique, i.e., a different hash function.

Support for amending the claims to require first and second hash techniques can be found in paragraphs [0022] and [0024]. No new matter has been added.

The amended claims require that the second hash values, which are determined using the second technique, only if the first hash values (those calculated over entire databases) do not match each other. The "second hash values" can thus be used to identify particular records of a database that require updating and avoid having to synchronize an entire database if the first hash values indicate that the database are, or likely to be, out of sync.

The applicant contends that the amendments to claims 1 and 15 traverse the rejection because Yianilos does not show or suggest the determination of database mismatch using hash values computed over an entire database, followed by the determination of which individual records are out of sync using a different hash technique. And just so there is no confusion with Yianilos and what it teaches, the claims require that the hash values be more computationally complex and *not* checksums.

By claiming that a first checksum is determined over an entire database using a *first technique* and that a second checksum is determined over an individual record using a *second technique*, the applicant's amended claims rebut the Examiner's argument in the office action that the applicant's first and second hash techniques read on Yianilos' determination of different hash values over different numbers of records. Since the amended claims require that a database

9

be comprised of records, the amended claims' recitation that the first hash value be determined using a first technique and the second hash value be obtained using a second technique, *requires* that the two techniques recited in the claims be different from each other, otherwise, the recitation of first and second techniques would be meaningless.

Federal Circuit case law requires that every claim limitation be given life and meaning. An Examiner cannot read out or ignore claim limitations in order to reject claims. In this case, the amended claims require two different hash techniques be used to compute two different hash values over two different forms and amounts of information.

Since *Yianilos* does not show or suggest the comparison of hash values computed over an entire database using a first technique, conditionally followed by the comparison of hash values computed over individual records of each database copy using a second and *different* technique, *Yianilos* does not anticipate claims 1 and 15 nor does it render them obvious. Claims 1 and 15 are now in condition for allowance. Claims that depend from claims 1 and 15 are therefore also in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

_____

Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telephone: (214) 446-6684
Fax: (214) 446-6692
robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com